

**REMARKS**

In response to the Final Office Action of February 4, 2010, reconsideration and allowance of the subject application in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested. Entry of this Response under Rule 116 is merited as it raises no new issues and requires no further search.

**Claims 1-14 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) over Cok et al. (US 6,570,584)**

Independent claims 1, 10, and 14 are similar in that they all recite “first sub-pixels ( $R_L$ ,  $G_L$ ,  $B_L$ )” and “second sub-pixels ( $R_C$ ,  $G_C$ ,  $B_C$ ).”

In the Response to Arguments section of the Office Action, the Examiner alleges that “parameters within parentheses within the claims are held only as labels for the sub pixels, and do not require that all of the sub pixels be of the RGB color scheme.” Applicants respectfully disagree and submit that the specification, in at least page 4, lines 11-24, supports Applicants’ argument that all of the sub pixels are of the same main colors within the RGB color scheme. Furthermore, Applicants submit that one of ordinary skill in the art would understand that the claimed sub-pixels are specifically red, green, and blue color generating pixels.

A rejection based on 35 U.S.C. §102 requires every element of the claim to be included in the reference, either directly or inherently. Accordingly, because Cok does not disclose, teach or suggest at least the above feature of claims 1, 10, and 14, Applicants’ recited feature of sub pixels of the RGB color scheme is distinguished over Cok and therefore the rejection of claims 1-14 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) is improper.

Specifically regarding claim 1, claim 1 recites wherein “the first EL material is of a higher lifetime than the second EL material; and the second EL material has a better colour point and/or better colour rendition properties than the first EL material.”

In page 2, the Office Action alleges that Cok, at column 3, lines 43-55, discloses an extra sub-pixel with a higher lifetime “for cyan/yellow/magenta where the lifetime of a pixel being inversely dependant upon its driving current, so the higher the efficiency of a pixel the lower the necessary driving current and thus the higher its lifetime.” Applicants respectfully disagree and submit that at the cited disclosure, Cok appears to only disclose an extra sub-pixel element to increase the efficiency and lifetime of the display device, and does not suggest using an individual

sub-pixel of higher lifetime. More specifically, at column 3, lines 45-55, Cox appears to suggest that the display may have a longer life because the additional sub-pixel has a color closer to the required color, and therefore the display does not have to be driven as hard for colors near the color of the additional sub-pixel. Nowhere does Cok suggest the use of a sub-pixel element with a higher lifetime. Hence, reliance on Cok to disclose using pixels of a higher lifetime appears to be misplaced.

Furthermore, Cok appears to use two sub-pixels with similar materials to work interchangeably. Claim 1, on the other hand, recites two sub-pixels with different materials, i.e., first EL material and second EL material.

Therefore, Cok fails to disclose or suggest wherein “the first EL material is of a higher lifetime than the second EL material; and the second EL material has a better colour point and/or better colour rendition properties than the first EL material,” as recited in claim 1.

Based on at least the forgoing reasons, Applicants believe independent claim 1 is allowable over Cok. Independent claims 10 and 14 are method and means plus function claims, respectively, recite subject matter similar to that of apparatus claim 1, and are likewise patentable over Cok. Claims 2-9 and 11-13 depend, respectively, from independent claims 1 and 10, and are likewise patentable over Cok.

For example, claim 3 depends from claim 1 and recites “circuitry (12) arranged to drive the display device such that when a colour or colour hue to be displayed by the pixel can be provided with a sufficient colour contribution of the main colour of the first and second sub-pixels by driving the first sub-pixel ( $R_L$ ,  $G_L$ ,  $B_L$ ) without driving the second sub-pixel ( $R_C$ ,  $G_C$ ,  $B_C$ ), then the first sub-pixel ( $R_L$ ,  $G_L$ ,  $B_L$ ) is driven but not the second sub-pixel ( $R_C$ ,  $G_C$ ,  $B_C$ ); and further arranged such that when the colour or colour hue to be displayed cannot be provided with a sufficient colour contribution of the main colour of the first and second sub-pixels by driving the first sub-pixel ( $R_L$ ,  $G_L$ ,  $B_L$ ) without driving the second sub-pixel ( $R_C$ ,  $G_C$ ,  $B_C$ ) then the second sub-pixel ( $R_C$ ,  $G_C$ ,  $B_C$ ) is driven.”

In page 4, the Office Action alleges that Cok, at column 3, lines 43-55, discloses the above feature of claim 3. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Cok, at column 3, lines 43-55, appears to only disclose using two sub-pixels. Claim 3, on the other hand, recites driving a first sub-pixel with a higher lifetime by itself or in combination with a sub-pixel with a better colour point and/or better colour rendition properties, depending upon whether the colour of the first sub-pixel is sufficient.

Based at least on the reasons above, claim 3, and claims 4-5 that depend therefrom, are allowable over Cok.

**Conclusion**

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application should be in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned attorney of record, to facilitate advancement of the present application.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 07-1337 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

LOWE HAUPTMAN HAM & BERNER, LLP

/Benjamin J. Hauptman/

Benjamin J. Hauptman  
Registration No. 29,310

1700 Diagonal Road, Suite 300  
Alexandria, Virginia 22314  
(703) 684-1111  
(703) 518-5499 Facsimile  
Date: May 4, 2010  
BJH/ERM/ser